

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the consideration given during the Interview of January 23, 2007. By way of summary, independent claims 1, 9, 10, 18 and 19 were specifically discussed as they pertain to the *Windows* reference applied and other potential rejections available to the Examiner. In addition, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 was discussed along with additional possible claim amendments in connection therewith. Accordingly, the above amendments and following remarks are provided to address both current and potential rejections of the claims.

Status of the Claims

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 17, 18 and 19. Claim 20 has been added. No claims have canceled. Claims 1-20 are now pending in this application.

Specification

In the Office Action, the Examiner requested that the specification be checked to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. It is respectfully submitted that the specification and been reviewed and amended accordingly. By these amendments, typographical errors and the like have been corrected; however no new matter has been entered into the application. Entry of the amendments to the specification is respectfully requested.

Drawings

In the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5), because they do not include reference signs described at page 9, paragraph [031], at element "226".

It is respectfully submitted that this portion of the specification has been amended to correctly refer to element "212", consistent with the remainder of the specification. By this amendment, no new matter has been entered into the application.

Accordingly, no drawing corrections are necessary and the Examiner is requested to withdraw the objection to the drawings.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 6 as depending from itself, and requiring correction thereof.

Claim 6 has been amended to now depend from claim 1, thereby removing the improper dependency. Approval and entry of the amendment to claim 6 is respectfully requested in order to remove the objection with respect thereto.

Rejection of Claims 10-17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 10-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Examiner has required that the program be reflected in the claims as being stored on at least a medium.

Responsive to the Examiner's rejection, Claim 10 has been amended to recite an application program for validating a request for managing multiple versions of content, the

application program stored on a computer readable medium. This language is consistent with the original application while addressing the Examiner's request.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 with respect to claims 10-17.

Rejection of Claims 10-17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Responsive to the Examiner's rejection, amendments to claim 10 above correct the antecedent basis of the phrase "said medium" in dependent claims 11-17.

Accordingly, all claims now present in the application are definite within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the rejection with respect thereto should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9-16, 18, and 19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-7, 9-16, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by non-patented document Microsoft, Microsoft windows XP SP1 (hereinafter "*Windows*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1, 9, 10, 18, and 19 as amended, now recite, *inter alia*, validating a request in connection with an interactive content database. Even further, the claims identify both a version of an item and a version of an object. Applicants respectfully submit that *Windows* fails to teach or suggest at least these features.

It is the Examiner's position that *Windows* corresponds to the independent claims as having each element depicted in FIG. 3 thereof. It is understood from the Interview that the Examiner accepts the distinction of the claimed invention over *Windows*, but cautions against future rejections. In this regard, the Examiner's suggestions have been helpful, and it is respectfully submitted that *Windows* also does not teach or suggest either a library server database or a content database. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 9, 10, 18 and 19 now further indicate that validating a request is in connection with an interactive content database.

In addition, it is Applicants' position that FIG. 3 of *Windows* illustrates a query in response to a user request to replace an existing file with a new file in an existing folder. Clearly, the *Windows* reference only compares an existing file (within a folder) to a potential replacement file and does not address or identify a version of the folder *per se*. Accordingly, *Windows* fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination of identifying both the version of the item and the version of the object such that a request is completed based on the version of the item and the version of the object. Further, *Windows* is entirely lacking in disclosure related to tracking and recording transaction attributes of the first age of the item and the second age of the at least one associated object as recited in claims 18 and 19.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that *Windows* fails to teach the features recited by claims 1-7, and 9-16, 18 and 19. Thus, claims 1-7, 9-16, 18 and 19 are patentable over *Windows*.

Rejection of Claims 8, and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over non-patented documents of Microsoft, Microsoft Windows XP SP1 ("*Windows*") in view of Mac OS

X: The Missing Manual ("*MacOSX*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Windows and *MacOSX* are well-known to be non-compactable with each other. That is, features on *Windows* and features on *MacOSX* are completely different operating systems, requiring, for example, different codes. Therefore, there is no motivation to combine *Windows* and *MacOSX* as attempted by the Examiner and the combination fails to establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection combination under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Further, even if combinable, Applicants respectfully submit that *Windows* fails to teach the features recited by claims 8 and 17 and *MacOSX* fail to supply the missing teachings of *Windows*. Thus, claims 8 and 17 are patentable over *Windows* in view of *MacOSX*.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 50-2961.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 24, 2007

By: Barbara A. Fisher
Barbara A. Fisher
Reg. No. 31, 906

for: Donald Min
Reg. No. 47,796